## CONGRESSIONAL

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES-JANUARY 25, 1848.

## THE MEXICAN WAR.

The resolutions referring the President's message being under consideration in Committee of the Whole on the state of

Mr. ROMAN rose and said : Mr. Chairman, I can scare ly repress the embarrassment I feel in raising my voice for the first time in this hall, surrounded as I am by the assembled wisdom of the nation; and but for the course this debate has taken within the last few days I should have continued a silent listener. It is true I had intended at a future time to make some comments on the subject of the tariff, but I assure th committee that until very recently nothing could have been further from my thoughts than to make a speech on the origin and causes of the Mexican war, and the conduct of the President in relation to it. In truth, sir, I had discussed that subject so frequently previous to the late election in Maryland as to persuade myself at least that the President was so clearly wrong in assuming the Rio Grande as the boundary of Texas, and the evidence so conclusive against him, that it must be regarded as a settled question, scarcely open to further debate.

But the President in his recent message has again asserted

and in almost every paragraph substantially repeated, that all the territory east of the Rio Grande belonged to Texas, and was included within her limits when admitted as a State into our Union, and which he was therefore bound to defend. T sustain this position, his friends on this floor have since exert-ed all their zeal, and prominent amongst them my honorable friend and colleague, (Mr. McLang.) the other day, in a speech of great ability, was its earnest and zealous advocate. But his reasoning, as I hope to show, was based upon an erroneous view of the facts, which, being corrected, his whole superstruc-

ture of argument must fall.

In addition to this, sir, a distinguished Senator from Mary land, for whom I entertain the kindest personal regard and the most profound respect, has recently advanced opinions, in the other wing of this Capitol, tending to sustain the views of the President; to which, however, I should not have deemed it President; to which, however, I'should not have deemed it proper to allude had not his speech been already introduced into this debate by my colleague, and thore particularly by the gentleman from Indians, (Mr. ROBINSON,) as evidence of the orinions of Maryland on this subject.

Under such circumstances I feel it incumbent on me, as one of the Representatives of that Sjate, to say to this House that, so far as I am authorized to speak for her people, they enter-

so far as I am authorized to speak for her people, they emer-tain a widely different opinion, and I am now here to give the reasons for the faith which is in us. And in reply to the gentleman from Virginia, who has just taken his seat, (Mr. Bedinger,) who so kindly warned us of that whirlwind of popular indignation which awaited us if we scrutinized too severely the President's conduct, let me assure that gentleman that, in the district which I have the bonor to represent, this subject has been already discussed, that whirlwind has already arisen, and the first effect of its fury was to send me here the first Whig save one, that ever represented that district in

But, sir, there is a preliminary question on which I desire to remark; and that is, how far it is consistent with true patriotism for us to speak, freely and boldly, our real sentime even though it be in terms of censure, respecting the conduct of the President in relation to the Mexican war. He has denounced it as "moral treason," and it has been oft repeated by his friends in this hall that we must not breathe a word of censure lest we give "aid and comfort" to the enemies of our country. Heaven forbid that I should subject myself to such When my country, is at war I know but two parties—the one is my country the other is her enemy and mine. I would that her President should never err; and if an approving resolution of this House would make his conduct right it should have my vote to-day. Or if it would convince the world, and cause other nations and the impartial page of future history to exempt my country from all blame, it would present a strong inducement to violate that conscientious regard for truth which I have ever made the guide of my life. But, sir, the truth of the President's position is a question of fact. The evidence has been given to the world, and that great jury will render its verdict accordingly, notwithstanding our resolves to the contrary. It would, therefore, be the extreme of folly to shut our eyes to the truth, and then, because we cannot see,

like the ostrich, suppose ourselves hidden from all others.

But this novel doctrine of passive obedience, that a bold and fearless expression of our opinions here is inconsistent with patriotism, is one to which I can never subscribe. It is an abandonment of our highest privilege, a dereliction of our most sacred duty. Our President is neither a Caear nor a Napoleon. He had no right to expect that his conduct would escape the severest scrutiny of a free people, jealous of their liberties. The right of free discussion undoubtedly renders our Government unfitted for a war of conquest, which is most successfully waged by a despot; and that consideration should successions waged by a despot; and that consideration should have deterred him from commencing it, wi hout the consent of Congress. The fact that he has placed himself in such a position shall never be admitted as a reason why we should abandon our rights as a co-ordinate branch of the Government, and our duty to those we represent. He ought to have known, and he must be made to know, that he is but a co-ordinate branch, and that Congress is exclusively the warmaking power; and I trust every member on this floor will sentiments, whether in praise or censure, with that

ndependence becoming the representative of a free people.

Where will such a doctrine lead? The President and his where will such a decrine lead. The residual with the subjugating and annexing all Mexico; or if he adopts the suggestion of my colleague, he will conquer, for the purpose of "giving mate, it contains about 100,000 souls, exclusive of Indians to censure, will be stop there 'Surely not. Having so kindly aided Mexico in establishing free institutions, you cannot refuse the boon of your cannon and your swords to Central America for the same purpose. She is infinitely worse governed than ever Mexico has been, and humanity and philan thropy will alike demand that you should cut their throats "to noral and physical strength to her people and institutions." And yet the lip of censure in this hall must be her metically sealed, lest we give "aid and comfort" to the

Again. Our next President may be a Northern Democrat without "Southern feeling," and deeming it "his destiny" to extend the area of anti-slave territory, and "to give mora and physical life to the people of the Canadas," may order an and when menaced by the rear of the British lion, gentlemen on the other side would denounce it as rank Ireason to give "aid and comfort" to an enemy so powerful. Not a word aid and comfort" to an enemy so powerful. of complaint could be permitted, the breath of censure must be hushed until we should conquer "an honorable peace." But where would be our constitution ' Where our lib Broken-lost-sunk in the veriest despotism.

Gentlemen on the other side call upon us to stand by or Sir, I reciprocate the feeling—the patriotism of my heart is as ardent and as pure as theirs. And I reciprocate the call. I call upon them to stand by our country in this the hour of her greatest peril. We concur in feeling, but differ as to the enemy. They say it is Mexico. Sir, when was Mexico an enemy dangerous to our safety? It is true it has cost us much blood to connec her; but if we had let her alone, as we should have de an enemy, she was, and is, and ever must be beneath our The enemy which I dread is much more dan gerous to our constitution. The wise patriarchs of our country have enjoined on us the sacred duty of restraining each branch of the Government within its own legitimate sphere, as the only safeguard of our free institutions. And I call upon gentlemen to stand by our country, for a far more dan-gerous enemy than Mexico is now at our doors. The Executive branch of the Government is fast swallowing up the others. The legislative power is nullified by his absolute veto. The President has waged a war which Congress neve declared, the objects whereof are only known to himself His will has usurped the place of the constitution and the law and he now wields a power which causes the dignity and authority of Congress to tremble to its foundation. I call upon them to stand by our country-" Cresar has crossed the Ru

con." The constitution demands our vigilance. But wherefore should we restrain our speech? The lim of Texas is a question of fact, and, as such, it was decided in the other end of this Capitol adversely to the position now assumed by the President, before he was elected. jection of the Tyler treaty, in effect, decided that the Rio Grande was not the bor Grande was not the boundary of Texas—that her territory did not extend to that river. The President has now chosen the opposite ground.

If that decision was right, the Presi
dent roust be wrong.

Mexico knew of that decision long before the war commenced. We cannot now recall or change it. If she can derive aid and comfort from such a cause, she has it already, and no act of ours can add to or diminish the effect which it has produced. I sincerely believed the Senate was right, and I have seen no cause to change that opinion,

nor can I hesitate to declare it Gentlemen on the other side have contended, and I so un derstood my colleague, (Mr. McLANE,) that war was the result of the annexation of Texas. But such is not the fact. Although Mexico recalled her minister, and talked of war, yet, when first applied to, she consented to receive a "com-missioner" to adjust that difficulty by treaty; and her minis-ter, in a letter to our consul, Mr. Biack, dated October 31, 1845, informed him "that the Government of Mexico had given its orders for the purpose of suspending any act of hos-tility against the United States, and limits itself to the defen-

sive, awaiting the issue of the proposed a gotiation."

At this period Texas was annexed, but war did not exist Has Mexico performed her pledge? I regret to say we never gave her the opportunity. No "commissioner" was ever sent. The President sent a "minister," which was not within the terms of her agreement. And again : the War Department, in its letter to Gen. Taylor, July 8, 1845, instructed him to avoid any act of aggression as long as the re-lations of peace continue. I urge these facts as conclusive that the nations were still at peace, and were so regarded by

Another ground on which the President and his friends on its floor have attempted to justify his conduct in relation to his floor have attempted to justify his conduct in relation to his war, is the claim for indemnity to our citizens for spoliations upon our commerce. It is true that Mexico was indebtthis floor have attempted to justify his conduct in relation to this war, is the claim for indemnity to our citizens for spoliations upon our commerce. It is true that Mexico was indebted to the amount of perhaps three millions of dollars. Gen. Jackson, in February, 1837, called the attention of Congress to it, and if Mexico should refuse, after one more effort, recommended "reprisals." Mr. Van Buren again submitted it to Congress, December 5th, 1837; but in both instances ongress refused even to authorize reprisals. Afterward commissions were appointed to adjust the amount, and dispute cases were referred to the King of Prussia; before the expira ion of the time limited claims were adjusted to the amount two millions and twenty six thousand dollars. Mexico agreed to pay this by instalments, and did pay the first, second, and third, but that which fell due in April, 1844, was not paid, and is still due, together with the subsequent instalments.

I do not mean to raise the question whether Congress migh

not have declared war for such a cause, according to the law of nations; but I do not mean to assert that the President and I mean to say further, that I will never vote to declare

war for the non-payment of a debt, which the debtor admits and is willing but unable to pay. Nor will I ever sanction war carried on solely and exclusively for such a purpose. the question of authorizing a war for such a cause were not presented to this House, I do not believe it would receive ngle vote. However that may be, my mind is made up desire no argument on the subject. Other gentler is they please; but as for myself I will not do it. Other gentlemen may

Sir, I will not do it, because it is against the spirit of the age in which we live; and Maryland, which I have the honor n part to represent, is at this moment deliberating on the pro-priety of abolishing even imprisonment for debt. I will no lo it, because f concur with General Jackson, who declared in do it, because I concur with General Jackson, who declared in his message to Congress on this subject, in February, 1837, "that war should not be used as a remedy by just and gen 'erous nations, confiding in their strength, for injuries com 'mitted, if it can be honorably avoided." I will not do it, because I represent in part the State of Maryland, who, although she now stands proudly erect amongst the debt paying nations of the carth, has been but too recently behind the day in her payments; and I have too vivid a recollection of her humilistion to visit with war the same fault in Maries. humilation to visit with war the same fault in Mexico. I will not do it, because our citizens had also claims upon France for spoliations prior to 1800. Our Government by treaty released France, and made itself the debtor, yet they are not paid to this day. And when Congress passed a law for their payment, President Polk vetoed it, because there was not money in the Treasury. If such be a good excuse for us, I cannot refuse it to Mexico. I will not do it, because it is worse than the laws of ancient Greece, which authorized a creditor to sell his debtor into slavery. I will not do it, because it is as bad as the law of ancient Rome, which allowed a debtor to be cut to pieces and divided amongst his creditors; both of which have been condemned by all civilized nations. And, finally, I will not do it, because I represent a generous, magnaninous, and christian people, who, if a debtor is willing to pay, but cannot, would rather forgive him the debt than to cut

is throat because he is too poor to pay.

But these were not in fact the true origin, the real causes of he war. Sir, I believe the true cause is found in the celebrated order of January 13, 1846, by which the President di-rected the army to march to the Rio Grande. Whether he was justified in giving this order most depend upon the ques-tion whether the territory of Texas rightfully belonging to and sion into the Union extended to that river. If it did, the Pre-sident was bound to protect it; if it did not, he had no right to invade it. This, then, is the inquiry, and, as I have said, it is a question of fact. The evidence is chiefly documentary, and by such evidence, together with the admissions of

President, I propose to prove:
That the valley of the Rio Grande, on the east side or left bank of that river, was territory belonging to Mexico, to which Texas had no claim, over which she had never exercised jurisdiction, and which was not understood by Congress to be-long to her, or included by the joint resolutions of annexation; and the evidence of this was chiefly in the President's pos

Before I proceed to the proofs, a brief description of the cha racter and location of that section of country may be useful. That the Nucces was the ancient boundary of the province of Texas has not been denied, and I concede that, since her revolution in 1836, she has held and occupied the valley on both sides-Corpus Christi, and perhaps other settlemen s belonging to Texas, being on the western side, or right bank, of that

After leaving the valley of the Nueces we come upon a vast arid desert, which has been by some means surnamed "that stupendous desert," and which is about one hundred and fifty miles wide. This desert has not been occupied by either nation, being unfitted for the habitation of man. After crossing this desert we come upon the valley of the Rio Grande, which is the disputed ground. The east side or left bank of that river is at many points a wide, and, I believe, a fertile valley, and contains twenty-six towns and villages, of sufficient magnitude to be deemed worthy of being designated by name up on a recent map of that country which is now before me; of which Taos has a population of 2,000, Santa Fe 5,000, Albuquerque 5,000, and others of intermediate size, but in the larger proportion of them the number of their population is not marked. For the first two hundred miles up the river the towns on the left or east bank are not numerous—Santiago, Point Isabel, Loredo, and some others being the principal. But higher up the river it is densely populated, and the map which I hold in my hand is thickly dotted with towns and vilresented on this floor. And, sir, it is a strange fact that, in presented on this floor. And, sir, it is a strange fact that, in this nineteenth century, in this age of travellers and book-makers, of railroads and telegrophs, the rulers and people of this wide-spread republic should have been convulsed, as they have been for more than a year, by doubts and discussions repecting the true characteristics of such a numerous, civilized. and christian people—to what Government they belonged; to whom they looked for protection; to whom they acknowledged allegiance; whether Mexico or Texas, as sovereign de facto, gave laws to and exercised jurisdiction over them; and a more remarkable fact that such a question should be still debated by he President and the Representatives of the people as one involved in continued and hopeless obscurity. Sir, it is not a doubtful question. That these people were Mexicans, under

the jurisdiction of Mexico, I regard as a fixed and section that the jurisdiction of Mexico, I regard as a fixed and section that And now for the proofs. And, first, I will examine those adduced to sustain the views of the President and the claim of adduced to sustain the views of the President and the claim of Texas. Prominent amongst these is the famous "treaty". Texas, by which he acknowledged her independence, with the Rio Grande as her boundary. That paper reads thus:

the Rio Grande as her boundary. That paper reads thus:

"That the President Santa Anna, in his official character as chief of the Mexican nation, and the Generals Don Vincente Filisols, Don Jose Urrea, Don Joaquin Ramires y Segma, and Don Antonio Gaona, as chiefs of armics, do solemnly acknowledge, sanction, and ratify the full, entire, and perfect independence of the Republic of Texas, with such boundaries as are hereafter set forth and agreed upon for the same. And they do solemnly and respectively pledge themselves, with all their personal and official attributes, to procure, without delay, the final and complete ratification and confirmation of this agreement, and all the parts thereof, by the proper and legitimate Government of Mexico, by the incorporation of the same into a solemn and perpetual treaty of amity and commerce, to be negotiated with that Government at the city of Mexico, by ministers plenipotentiary to be deputed by the Government of Texas for this high purpose."

I pass over the fact, obvious on the face of that paper, that

I pass over the fact, obvious on the face of that paper, that does not even profess to be a "treaty," but a mere "pledge" the origin the part of Santa Anna to procuse the confirmation of that surfacement" by the Government of Mexico. Nor will I rely upon the fact that Santa Anna had no power to make a treasure Co on the fact that Santa Anna had no power to make a treation of the fact that Santa Anna had no power—both which are fatal sections to it. Nor will I dwell upon the fact that General Chem, in his letter to Santa Anna in 1836, did not even

There is still one further proof, which neither the Presiackson, in his letter to Santa Anna in 1836, did not even all it a treaty, but an agreement. But I do insist that, be it duresse." Santa Anna was a prisoner of war ; he had statement of the facts would procure the unanimous deon of that tribunal that it was null and void.

36, declaring the Rio Grande to be her boundary. On this t I pass over the fact that Judge Ellis, who was President the Texan Convention, and member of that Congress which sed the law, stated that "the boundaries were fixed solely ofessedly with a view of having a large margin in the g tiation with Mexico, and not with the expectation of re-ning them." But I will ask my colleague if the Legislaof Maryland, now in session, should pass a law declaring a Potomee no longer her boundary, but the James river, sether such a law would give Maryland any title to the invening territory, or whether Virginia would therefore surnder her jurisdiction over it? Yet I affirm that such a law

ould be just as effectual in fixing the boundary of Maryland this act of Congress was to establish that of Texas.

My honorable colleague (Mr. McLane) has, however, discred a new fact, which he thinks " settles the question a

ue." He says:

"A reference to this act of admission of the State of Texas
common 29, 1845) will show that it was the State of Texas
at was admitted, with a constitution already formed, affirmthe declaratory statutes which defined the boundary west
the Ris Grande; and with such boundary she was admitted tate into the Union."

I confess, sir, I heard that statement with great surprise, at such an important fact should have been entirely over-oked. In all the discussions and newspaper controversies on a subject I had never seen or heard such a triumphant juscation of the President. I at once determined, if it cou shown that Texas was admitted as a State, " with a boundary defined," and that boundary "the Rio Grande," I would, east, practice the virtue of magnanimity, by declaring oper

ing, it repeals the act of 1836, being inconsistent with the coint resolutions of anneration. The first of these resolutions is as follows:

"That Congress doth consent that the territory properly "That Congress doth consent that the territory properly neluded within and rightfully belonging to the republic of Fexas may be erected into a new State, to be called the State of Texas, with a republican form of government, to be adopted by the people of said republic, by deputies in convention assembled, with the consent of the existing Government, in order that the same may be admitted as one of the States of this

Jaion.

"That the foregoing consent of Congress is given upon the condition that the said State be formed subject to the adjustment by this Government of all questions of boundary that may trise with other Governments."

This condition obviously denies to Texas the right to defin any boundary, and reserves that question to be adjusted by this Government. Now the constitution of Texas, under which she was admitted as a State, contains this important

"Sec. 3. All laws and parts of laws now in force in the "Sec. 3. All laws and parts of laws now in force in the republic of Texas, which are not repugnant to the constitution of the United States, the joint resolutions for annexing Texas to the United States, or to the provisions of this constitution, shall continue and remain in force as the laws of this State until they expire by their own limitation, or shall be altered or repealed by the Legislature thereof."

Thus, you perceive, this constitution affirms such laws only as are not inconsistent with the joint resolutions of annexation, and, by necessary implication, repeals all such as are inconsistent. The act of Congress of 1836, which defines the Rio Grande as the boundary, is clearly inconsistent with the joint

Grande as the boundary, is clearly inconsistent with the joint resolutions, and is therefore repealed. I thank my colleague freelutions, and is therefore repealed. I thank my colleague for alluding to this constitution, for it utterly destroys all pretence of claim on the part of Texas, under her act of 1836, which get has hitherto been put forward by the President as the leading fact in his defence.

Do not understand me to impute to my colleague the intention to mislead. On the contrary, I have no doubt he was misled by a too credulous reliance on the statements in the President's message, which, on examination since, I find asserts the same position, but which had previously escaped my

serts the same position, but which had previously escaped my

And now, having shown the pretended treaty to be null and void, and the Texan act of Congress repealed, what further evidence has been adduced by the President and his friends to sustain the extended claims for Texas? There is none, to sustain the extended claims for Texas? There is none, there can be none, except her revolutionary title by conquest. To sustain this title she must show an actual possession, or the exercise of jurisdiction. And my colleague states truly, that so far as the people west of the Nueces participated in her revolution, and have since acknowledged the Government of Texas, so far can she claim title by conquest. And I have assumed the task of proving that Texas never had possession or jurisdiction in the valley of the Rio Grande, nor did its people acknowledge her as their sovereign. It is true that General Rusk once marched into the town of Loredo, on the bank of that river, (the inhabitants making no resistance, passed over the river, fought the Mexicans at Mier, returned to Loredo, and, after remaining in all about one week, came bank to the Nucces. But the inhabit ants never changed their allegiance, nor has Texas at any time since pretended to exallegiance, nor has Texas at any time since pretended to ex-ercise jurisdiction over them. Excepting this one instance, I cannot discover that Texas ever had possession of any point on the Rio Grande. There is no other town in which the Texan flag was ever given to the breeze, and in very few did Texan liag was ever given to the breeze, and in very lew did any Texan ever set his foot, except as a prisoner of war. Sir, I might quote many passages from the letters of Major Donel-son, our Chargé to Texas, proving this fact. He says: Texas holds Corpus Christi, Mexico holds Santiago, Texas has, at times, possessed Loredo, &c. but above the line of New Mex-ico there has been no "occuprincy" by Texas.

I might also refer to the letter from the War Department to

Gen. Taylor, as follows : Gen. Taylor, as follows:

"WAR DEPARTMENT, JULY 8, 1845.

"Size: This Department is informed that Mexico has some military establishments on the east side of the Rio Grande, which are, and for some time time have been, in the actual occupancy of her troops. In carrying out the instructions herefore received you will be careful to avoid any acts of aggression, unless an actual state of war should exist. The Mexican orces at the posts in their possession, and which have been so will not be disturbed so long as the relations of peace between 

"Brig. Gen. Z. TAYLOR." Here the Secretary of War admits that Mexico had military establishments, garrisoned by her trops, on the east side of the river. Is this consistent with the possession of Texas by conquest? This letter is also full proof that there were no Texans there, for there never has been a period since their revolution when a Texan would dare to reside under the guns

of a Mexican garrison.

But, sir, I have much stronger proof than this.

But, sir, I have much stronger proof than this. Gen. Taylor, in marching to the Rio Grande, approached Point sabel, he was met by the Prefect, or Governor of the State of Tamaulipas, who protested against the invasion, in isting that it was no part of Texas, nor had his people any connexion with the Texan revolution or annexation. He said they had always been attached to Mexico, and would never consent to dissolve or change their allegiance. Gen. Taylor's orders required him to advance, and the people set fire to their dwellings and fled beyond the Rio Grande. Yet the President asserts that these were Texan citizens, whim her rightful limits. A marvellous fact! inexplicable conduct! that citizens of the State of Texas, just admitted into the Union at their own request, should fire their dwellings at the approach of our stripes and stars, and fly for protection—to whom? To Mexico, which, my colleague says, had at that very time were Mexicans?

Again: when Kendall and his fellow theoners were fined for months if not years in Santa Fe, to whom did our Government apply for their release? To Texas? No. We negotiated with Mexico, and Mexico released them. Yet the President affirms that Santa Fe was within the republic of

The joint resolutions of annexation left the boundary an open question; and that Congress did not regard the east valley of the Rio Grande as forming part of Texas, is evident from the history of that measure. The rejection of the Tyler treaty is conclusive of the question. It was construed to adopt the Rio Grande as the boundary, and for that reason was rejected. In the debate upon it the distinguished Sena-tor from Missouri, (Mr. BENTON,) the pet of the Administration, and whom it vainly endeavored to make Lieutenant General, to command the hero of Buena Vista, declared that to extend our jurisdiction to the Rio Grande would be an act of unparalleled outrage and direct aggression upon Mexico; and the Hon. Silas Wright, that great cracy, voted against it because "it embraced a country which Texas had no claim, over which she had never asserted jurisdiction, and which she had no right to cede. Democratic Senate affirmed these views, and rejected the treaty by the decisive vote of 35 to 16.

And, in this House, the honorable gentleman from Penn sylvania, (Mr. C. J. INGERSOLL.) then chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, and who reported those resolutions, in his able speech in their support designates "that stopendous desert" between the Nueces and the Rio Grande the boundary of Texas. He says, "there ends the valley of the West, there Mexico begins.

This evidence might be deemed sufficient to indicate the This evidence might be deemed summer to But I stop views of Congress respecting the limits of Texas. But I stop not here. A still stronger alustration is found in the passage of the Congress title. "An of an act at the same session with the following title: "An act allowing drawback on foreign merchandise exported in the original packages to Chihuahua and Santa Fe, in Mexi-

ty, but an agreement. But I do insist that, be it it contract, it was null and void, because obtained gauge of Scripture, "out of thine own mouth will I judge thee." His own admissions bear witness that even he did not regard the east bank of the Rio Grande, including Santa not regard the east bank of the Rio Grande, including Santa have who hears me can for a moment doubt that, if a lawyer who hears me can for a moment doubt that, if a catract obtained under such circumstances were brought bearing the Supreme Court, now in session in this Capitol, the ments the province of New Mexico, with Santa Fe, its capion of that tribunal that it was null and void.

tal, has been captured without bloodshed." And he goes on the next evidence adduced is the Texan act of Congress of to say that he has exercised the right of a conqueror—

to say that he has exercised the right of a conqueror—

"By the establishment of temporary Governments in some of the conquered provinces in Mexico. In the provinces of New Mexico and the Californias Intle if any further resistance is apprehended from the inhabitants to the tempory Governments which have thus, from the necessity of case, and according to the laws of war, been established."

"I congratulate you on the success which has thus attended our military and naval operations. In less than seven months after Mexico commenced hostilities, at a time selected by herself, we have taken possession of many of her principal ports, driven back and pursued her invaining army, and acquired military possession of the Mexican provinces of Mew Mexico, New Leon, Coshoila, Tamaulipus, and the Californias."

"Well may the American people be proud of the energy and gallantryof our regular and volunteer officers and soldiers."

Wonderful subject of congratulation! I tresistible proof of

Wonderful subject of congratulation! Irresistible proof of the gallantry and bravery of our troops! By rapid move-ments th y have captured Santa Fe, which, being east of the Rio Grande, according to the same message is within the lim its of Texas.

By what right did he capture a city within the limits of s

sovereign State of this Union. By what right did he take military possession of New Mexico, whose capital was under our protection? By what right did he, "as conqueror," es-tablish a temporary Government within the limits of Texas? Why, sir, as to the rallantry and glory of the exploit, he might, with a small additional force, have marched through my district and captured the cry of Frederick, or Hagers-

one State or sovereignty being located within the limits and subject to the jurisdiction of another; yet such is the absurdity in which the President is inextricably involved by his position respecting this boundary—he is contradicted by almost every fact, he is contradicted by himself.

I have said the President, in protecting Mexico, had no right, under the constitution, to order the army beyond her limits; and if I have succeeded in showing that these did not extend to the Rio Grade, it follows, as a corollary, that in or dering the army to that river he was guilty of an unconstitu-

the real cause of this war, in which our country is so unfor-tunately involved. But for that order the Goddess of Peace would have still shed her smiles upon us; and on its athor

head must rest the responsibility.

My colleague (Mr. McLank) justifies this order of the President because Mexico had refused to receive our minister, who was sent with the olive branch. This attempt to justify admits the valley of the Rio Grande to be Mexican territory, for if it belonged to Texas no justification was necessary. And he must be hard pressed for a justification when he relies upon a fact not then known to exist. What evidence had the Executive at that time that Mexica had resident to the second to the Executive at that time that Mexico had refused to receive our minister? There was nothing to show he had arrived there. On the 20th January, 1846, seven days after the order was given, the Secretary of State acknowledged the re-ceipt of two letters from Mr. Slidell, dated November 30th and December 17th, the first stating his arrival at Vera Cruz, the second his arrival in Mexico. True, those letters may have been received before the 13th and not acknowledged up til the 20th; but if they were, what do they prove? Not that he had been rejected—the last letter (December 17) sta-ted that he had submitted his credentials, and was informed they must be laid before the Council, of whose decision he would be notified. He further states that the refusal "to receive him as minister was a possible and perhaps a probable event;" and in fact he was not finally rejected till the 12th March, two months after the order was given. The only knowledge which the President then possessed was the possi-bility, or perhaps probability, that Mexico would refuse him

bility, or perhaps probability, that Mexico would refuse him as minister, and is clearly no justification for invading her territory. Sir, it is true he sent the olive branch with one hand, but with the other he sent the sword.

But my colleague (Mr. McLang) has endeavored to shield the President and shift the responsibility of this fatal order, by stating that it was given in consequence of the advice of Gen. Taylor. But, sir, he is not sustained by the facts. He does manifest injustice to that gallant officer. This charge was stereotyped through almost every county in Maryland previous to the late election by a distinguished political orato of that State. I refuted it then in my district, and cannot in silence permit its repetition here. I thank my colleague for his merited eulogy of Gen. Taylor, but, in his behalf, must decline the honor of being the author or adviser of that move ment. Under what circumstances was that advice given?
Why, sir, not until after Mr. Bancroft wrote to him June 15,

1845, as follows:
"The point of your ultimate destination is the western from tier of Texas, where you will select and occupy, on or near the Rio Grande del Norte, such a site as will consist with the health of the troops, and to protect what, in the event of an nexation, will be our western border."

Again, July 30, 1845, the Department wrote to him-"It is expected that, in selecting the establishment for your troops, you will approach as near the boundary line, the Rio Grande, as prudence will dictate."

Notwithstanding these instructions, Gen. Taylor, on the 15th of Augus', encamped at Corpus Christi, on the Nucces; and not until the 4th of October, nearly four months after the first order was given, did he reply to it. In his letter to the De partment of that date, after reciting the instructions of June 15 and July 30, he says:
"It is with great deference that I make any suggestions

to which may become matter of delicate negotiation; but if our Government, in settling the question of boundary, makes the line of the Rio Grande an ultimatum, I cannot doubt the settlement will be greatly facilitated by our taking possession at once of one or two suitable points on or quite near that river."

"Mexico having as yet made no actual declaration of war, or compatited any oversteet of heritike."

or committed any overt act of hostility, I do not feel at liber-ty, under my instructions, particularly those of July the 8th, to make a forward movement to the Rio Grande without au-thority from the War Department."

It is obvious from this correspondence that Gen. Taylo never originated or advised this movement. He said nothing of it till months after he had been twice informed his ultimate destination was the Rio Grande; and even then he only concurs in the policy of such a movement, under the provise of that river being made the ultimatum. He manifestly regard-ed it as likely to interfere with "delicate negotiation," and therefore the instructions I have read were deemed insufficient and he required further authority from the Department. Sir Gen. Taylor is in nowise responsible for that order. The Administration cannot shield itself under his advice, because

was to be insisted on as our ultimatum.

But that is the very ground of our complaint. The President had no right to decide in advance that the Rio Grande would be our western border. He had no right to insist on such an ultimatum at the hazard of war. The joint resolu-tions gave him no such authority. They only authorized him to negotiate: and a novel mode of negotiation he adopted— took porsession to the extremest limits claimed, and said to Mexico, We'll negotiate, but if you dispute this line, we'll whip you. If England had adopted such a mode in the Ore-

Our President rode into power on the cry of the whole of Oregon, and insisted on our title to 54° 40′ as clear and unquestionable; but when the British lion growled he prudently advised with the Sena'e, and accepted the parallel of °49, to the great displeasure of many of his friends. And it may be that he supposed, if he could negotiate with a strong hand for a slice of Mexico, it would make up the loss and satisfy it might encircle his Administration with a blaze of military glory. I do not charge this upon the President; all I mean to say is, that his conduct was well adapted to promote quarrel with Mexico, and certainly creates a strong suspicior that he was not so desirous of peace as he would have the

world believe.

Mr. McLane. Will my colleague allow me to ask him whether the constitution of Texas does not define the Rio

Grande as its western boundary?

Mr. Roman, (with other voices.) No.

Mr. McLane. Then how could the parallel of 36° 30', mentioned in the joint resolutions, apply to the territory of Texas, which would fall below that line, unless the Rio Grande

Mr. ROMAN. I have not examined the map as to that one tion, but I presume that parallel was inserted in the joint re-solutions merely to guard the question of slavery, in case terri-tory should be acquired above that line, it being uncertain

what line might be established by negotiation.

I have said the President's conduct, whether so intended or not, was well adapted to produce war; and, as if to furnish Gen. Taylor with "a forman worthy of his steel," whilst with one hand he sent him into Mexico at the head of an with one hand he sent him into Mexico at the head of an American army, with the other he permitted Santa Anna's return to that country—the only man who could harmonize her distracted councils, and the only General who could lead her armies into the field. Well, sir, Santa Anna raised an army of twenty thousand, which, in all probability, never would have been raised but for his presence. He met Gen. Taylor at Buena Vista; they fought, and Gen. Taylor, to the astonishment of the world, was victorious. In that, like every other field, he was enabled to say, "veni, vidi, vici" But oh, tell it not in Gath! the very day, or at least the same week, in which he achieved that glorious victory, a tyrant majority of the President's friends in this hall were engaged in strangling the expression of public gratitude in a resolution of thanks to the old hero who had thus "filled the measure of his country's military glory." Yes, sir, that meed of praise, tha laurel wreath, was refused to the brow of Gen. Taylor which had never before been denied to any officer above a subaltern who had in the least distinguished himself on the battle-field. And why? For what reason was it refused? Sir, I can conceiv of no other reason than because every southern breeze from the scene of war bore on its wings the name of Gen. Taylor as a candidate for the Presidency, which was echoed from lip to lip until it came rushing like a fire in the prairie, and threatened to overspread the whole country. Our terrified President saw "the ghost of Banquo" rising to seat itself in his chair, and straightway the order was passed "to put him down." But Banquo's ghost would not down at their bidding, and although he is not yet seated in the Presidential chair, yet he is still "shaking his gory locks," to the infinite terror of the President and his whole party.

But, sir, whatever may have been the causes of the war,

bowever unnecessarily or unconstitutionally it may have been the causes of the war, however unnecessarily or unconstitutionally it may have been the President, we are bound, as legislators and as statesmen, to view our relations with Mexico as they now in fact exist. We can neither roll back the tide of time nor the current of events; but, with an eye single to our country's good, determine the expense of the sake of argument, that Mexico has insulted and wrong-

show that peace—an honorable peace—might have been obtained in the recent negotiation by Mr. Trist, and I believe might now be obtained, if the President would limit his demands to that boundary which would best promote our real welfare. In that negotiation Mexico showed a desire for peace. might, with a small additional force, have marched through my district and captured the civy of Frederick, or Hagerstown, or Cumberland, and it would have formed just as fit a subject for "congratulation" as the capture of Santa Fe, if the Rio Grande be the boundary of Texas.

I fear these new doctrines of the President will unsettle all.

Francisco, which our Government so much desired. It is true,

obtain the most formingner parter.

the better to secure the harmony of both, and to avoid those border collisions which have so often disturbed the peace of nations. A river like the Rio Grande, not wider than the Potomac, is not a desirable boundary between nations so dis-similar in color, in lineage, in language, in laws, and in their similar in color, in lineage, in language, in laws, and in their religion, and also deeply imbued with a deadly hate arising from this war, which must continue to exist for a century to came. Densely settled on both banks, and easily fordable, it is not a sufficient barrier to prevent those endless collisions which must so frequently arise. One wrong, or fancied wrong, begets retaliation, which, in turn, must be revenged. Hence a border war, the worst and most cruel of all wars, will ensue, and be fatal to the peace of both. The proposed line beyond the river is a mere ideal surveyor's line, and of course doubly

objectionable.

The boundary which I would suggest is a line commence. The boundary which I would suggest is a line commencing on the Gulf at the Arroyo Colorado, or centre of that "stupendous desert" between the Nucces and the Rio Grande, and running by a straight line to the intersection of the thirty-second degree of latitude with the twenty-fifth degree of longitude west from this Capitol: thence bearing west of north and dividing the waters of the Rio Grande from those which flow eastwardly to the Gulf, to the thirty-seventh degree of latitude, thence with that parallel to the Pacific ocean. This desert is the true geographical division, a gigantic barrier, which, ever since the purchase of Louisiana, has been regarded by our wisest statesmen as the true boundary between the two nations most advantageous to both, and is recomgarded by our wisest statesmen as the true boundary between the two nations most advantageous to both, and is recommended by a weight of authority entitled to our most serious consideration, and which ought not to be disregarded. As early as 1803, Mr. Jefferson, then President, endeavored to obtain it. In 1806, the House of Representatives requested him to secure it if possible. In 1816, Mr. Madison again made the attempt. In 1818, Mr. Monroe tried it, with no better success. And to show that a desert was then deemed important, I refer to a passage from the proposition made by our minister at Madrid: ninister at Madrid :

our minister at Madrid:

"I now propose that the desert, which is to form this barrier, be of thirty leagues breadth, that is, fifteen leagues on the right bank and fifteen leagues on the left bank of the Colorado, and extend ag in length, from the mouth of that river, as high up towards its source as the 32 deg. of north latitude; within the desert no person shall be admitted to settle or establish themselves. And each party may establish military posts on its own portion of the desert, for the purpose of keeping off intruders and settlers of every kind."—4 State Papers, p. 522. 522.

Again, in 1829, President Jackson, through Mr. Van Bu-Again, in 1829, President Jackson, through Mr. Van Bu-ren, Secretary of State, instructed Mr. Poinsett, our minister to Mexico, if possible, to purchase Texas; and in his letter, particularly describes the line, or boundary, which is regard-ed as the most desirable to us, and which is to run "in the centre of the desert or grand prairie which lies west of the Rio Nueces, and is represented to be nearly two hundred miles in width, and to extend north to the mountains." This, sir, is substantially the line I have suggested, and Mr. Van Burén presents strong arguments in its favor. He says :

"Without such a boundary, it is impossible to prevent that frontier from becoming the seat of an extensive system of smuggling, alike injurious to the true interest of both countries,

" and our present frontier (the Sabine) must continue to be a receptacle for smugglers and outlaws. " The present state of things is well calculated to create incessant difficulties and broils with the citizens of the adjacent parts of Mexico, " which may grow into astignal complaindifficulties and broils with the citizens of the adjacent parts of Mexico, \* which may grow into national complainings and heartburnings; and perpetually foster and inflame a spirit of jealousy, to which our neighbors are already so much inclined. \* It is the centre of a country uninhabitable on the Gulf, and on her mountains so inaccessible and so poor as to furnish no inducement for land intercourse. \* It would cause a wide separation, and difficulties of intreourse between the inhabitants of the two countries, and prevent those excitements and bickerings invariably produced by the contiguous operation of conflicting laws, habits, and interests."

In addition to these, I will also refer to the able speech of the honorable gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. C. J. I. S. Bansort.) on the annexation resolutions in 1845. In speaking of the importance of this boundary, he says:

ing of the importance of this boundary, he says:

"The stupendous deserts between the Nueces and the Bravo rivers are the natural boundaries between the Anglo-Saxon and the Mauritanian races There ends the valley of the west; there Mexico begins. Thence, beyond the Bravo, begin the Moorish people and their Iudian associates, to whom Mexico properly belongs; who should not cross that vast desert if they could, as, on our side, we too ought to stop there, BREAUSE interminable conflicts MUST ENSUE either our going south or their coming north of that gigantic boundary. While peace is their coming north of that gigantic boundary. While peace is cherished, THAT BOUNDARY WILL BE SACRED. Not till THE SPIRIT OF CONQUEST RACES will the people on EITHER side moest or mix with each other: and whenever they do, one or he other race must be conquered, if not extinguished."

Also, to a speech in the Senate by Mr. BENTON on the Cyler treaty. Speaking of this boundary, he says:

"This is the boundary between the United States and Mexico pointed out by the finger of Nature, agreed upon by eminent statesmen, as proper for Mexico as for ourselves, and written down in the book of fate and the law of nature as the f the New World. Soon or late, that boundary will be es-

tablished.
"The Rio Grande del Norte (Great River of the North) is

"The Rio Grande del Norte (Great River of the North) is a Mexican river by position and possession, and to the Mexicans may it forever belong! The Mississippi, and all its waters, are ours, and to us the dismembered parts must return. The country east of the Nucces, (and including it,) from position, geographical affinities, soil, products, and natural dependence, is appurtenant to the valley of the Mississippi, and must and will go where congruity and homogeniality attract it. No wise man, in an age of commerce, wants a great river (beyond its natural frontier) for a national boundary; it is a boundary fruitful of expense, and of every species of collision and collusion. A mountain and a desert plain is far better; and these we have between us and Mexico; and it would be just as unwise for us to project a segment or a salient angle of our frontier across this plain and mountain into the natural limits of Mexico, as it would be in her to make the same projection of a segment or angle of herself across the same plain and mountain into our natural dominion."

Unwise it would be, beyond question; yet the President's ultimatum projects that segment or salient angle, for the pur-pose of including New Mexico.

But I will not rest here. I now produce an authority which

I am sure gentlemen on the other side cannot dispute. It is no less than Old Hickory himself, and which I hope Young Hickory will respect and adopt. Gen. Jackson, in his letter to A. V. Brown, in February, 1843, speaks of his efforts to purchase Texas, and urges the annexation, because of the mportance, in a military point of view, of obtaining the oundary which would then be ours. He says of that boun-

dary:

"Which is of itself a fortification, on account of its extensive barren and uninhabitable plains. With such a barrier on our west, we are invincible. The whole European world could not, in combination against us, make an impression on our Union.

"From the Rio Grande, over land, a large army could not march, or be supplied, utless from the Gulf by water, which by vigilance could always be intercepted."

"It (Texas) is essential to us, particularly as lessening the probabilities of future collision with foreign Powers."

Now, sir, these reasons and opinions, with the facts on which they are based, in my judgment, furnish a conclusive argument in favor of the boundary. I have suggested. If you go beyond, geography presents nothing equal to it. But they prove a great deal more; they furnish an unanswerable objection to our accepting the cession of New Mexico, which lies beyond it. For the same gigantic barrier which would protect us from invasion would prevent us from affording due protection to the people of that province. It contains a po-pulation of 150,000 Mexicans, exclusive of Indians, not only dissimilar, but hortile to us. We should be bound to protect them against Mexico and the warlike tribes of Indians around them. Let us remember the duration and cost of the Florida war, with its bloodhound infantry. And what have we to

our honor; for I would make no peace in which that was not strictly guarded. What does our honor require ! Suppose, for the sake of argument, that Mexico has insulted and wrong-ed us to the full extent alleged by the President. Have we sent circumstances, will best promote our true honor, our real welfare, and our national glory.

Our form of government is not adapted to a war of conquest, and I trust the day is far distant when it will be sanctioned by the people. The country is undoubtedly weary of this war, and every patriot's eye is scanning the future, to discover, if he can, where will be the end; and I propose to show that peace—an honorable peace—might have been obtained in the sanction of the montesumes? Surely, sir, to pursue it further would saver more of malignant and fiendish revenge than the demands of true honor.

But what further satisfaction of our injured honor can be obtained? Surely not pecupiary satisfaction or land. Then what else can be had? The glories of the battle field are no what else can be had ?

on the side of the Gulf, she insisted upon the Nueces as her boundary, but, having nothing of the least value to her on that river, I believe she would have readily accepted that stupendous desert beyond, if it had been offered.

The President demanded, as his ultimatum, the Rio Grande up to the line of New Mexico: thence beyond that river, including New Mexico and the Californias, which were to be ceded to us.

I waive the inquiry, how far it consists with the magnanimity and true honor of a great and powerful nation to wrest by the sword from a weak neighbor a portion of her territory, not because I am insensible to the question, but because such considerations have little weight with those who are bent on conquest. But assuming the fact that Mexico is conquered, and we have the power to hold military possession of any part of her territory we may desire, I propose to show that, without the least disposition to give aid and comfort to Mexico, but looking solely to our own interest, we ought not to desire the aboundary demanded by the President; and our real welfare would forbid the acceptance of New Mexico were it offered as a gift.

In adjusting boundaries it has always been regarded of the tutmost importance to make them conform, as far as possible, to the natural or geographical divisions of the country, and obtain the most formidable barrier which the case will admit, the better to secure the harmony of both, and to avoid those border collisions which have so often disturbed the peace of nations. A river like the Rio Grande, not wither than the Potomae, is not a desirable boundary between nations so dis-

have more than we can sell at this rate in the next hundred and fifty years. Sir, I should consider it rather doubtful poli-

and fifty years. Sir, I should consider it rather doubtful policy to purchase territory now, to be enjoyed after such a lapse of time; but surely it were worse than madness to wage a war, at the cost of some forty millions per annum, for territory which posterity may or msy not want a century and a half hence. If posterity should want it, let them purchase it, and if they cannot, they can settle upon it, and then, by a little ledgerdemain, annex it as we have done Texas.

Then, sir, if our wants and our interest do not require more territory, and both forbid the acceptance of New Mexico, and if our country's honor and glory demand an immediate peace, why not have it at once? Mexico would gladly accept the boundary I have suggested, and a treaty made on such a basis would be hailed with joy by the country. Sir, our people generally are not favorable to war, and in addition to this, the idea of a war of conquest is attended by a deep and pervading consciousness of wrong, which renders them still more desirous that this war should be ended. Then let it cease; let our country once more receive the smile and rest on the pillow of peace.

I have said that we have more lead than we can sell in one rest on the pillow of peace.

I have said that we have more land than we can sell in one

I have said that we have more land than we can sell in one hundred and fifty years. Why wage war for more? What revelation from destiny have we that our Government will continue a century and a half? Heaven grant it may; and I have little doubt it will, provided we cultivate that intelligence, morality, and integrity of our people, which has heretolore been regarded as our surest foundation. But, sir, all history proves that war is a terrible enemy to morals, and leads to a mixt of description. history proves that war is a terriors enemy to morals, and leads to a spirit of despotism; and, if these mad projects of the subjugation and annexation of all Mexico, in which the plans of the Executive must ultimately result, should find favor with the nation, it will make every patriot tremble for the fate of our country. History affords us many examples

and I implore gentlemen on the other side not to turn a dear to its truthful warnings.

Turn for a moment to ancient Rome. This mad ambition this spirit of conquest pervaded her councils. She added con this spirit of conquest pervaded her councils. She added conquest to conquest—country after country submitted to her overwhelming power—but what was the result? The Gothand the Visigoths, the Vandals and the Huns, must give the mournful answer. 'A swarm of barbarians from that grean northern hive overspread the sunny plains of Italy, and all he conquests, even to the classic shores of Greece, one by one her eagles fell—Imperial Rome herself bowed her neck to the conqueror—and Alaric and Attila successively swayed the sceptre of the Cassars over that land of liberty and science of closures and some Alaric, "the Part of Nations" and of eloquence and song—Alaric "the Pest of Nations," an Attila "the Scourge of God."

Attila "the Scourge of God."

Or turn for a moment to revolutionary France. Napoleor that "spoiled child of victory," and I may add of "destiny, rose like a meteor in the night; he conceived himself to he the chosen minister of Fate to extend the area of republica institutions, and, by means of the sword, to confer on neighboring nations the blessings of liberty. He went forth corquering and to conquer. Throne after throne tottered ar fell—kingdom after kingdom was added to his conquests. The premise of Egypt were his, and the shores of the Baltic as fe'l-kingdom after kingdom was added to his conquests. It Pyramids of Egypt were his, and the shores of the Baltic as knowledged his sway. But what was the end? He wou subject Russia also to his "military possession." The is habitants fled before him, and there was just as little prospect. of resistance as we have now; but when conquest was with his grasp, he encountered an enemy whom he "wot not of and whose wrath his conduct had been little calculated appearse. God, who delivered the Ammonites and Philistin into the hands of Israel—God, who overwhelmed Pharaand his host in the waters of the sea, and whose fire consu-ed the "cities of the plain"—God, the avenger of a natio crimes—with his chilling blast and driving snow, smote cimes—with his chilling blast and driving snow, smote invading army in the moment of victory, and sent him, whad never qualled or fled before, trembling and flying into hand of his enemies, by whom he was condemned to a ligering captive life, on a lonely and inhospitable rock, the of St. Helena. Sir, Omnipotence has hitherto shed up us his choicest blessings, but I would warn my country of danger of too far tempting his providence.

And why should we desire to force our institutions upon

clustant people? What has the President said on the subjection of the Chairman's hammer was the only answ nd Mr. R. resumed his seat.

## OFFICIAL.

GENERAL ORDERS, ADJUTANT GENERAL'S OFFICE, Washington, February 3, 18 AN ACT to provide clothing for volunteers in the ser

of the United States.

"Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Repres-tives of the United States of America in Congress assem That in lieu of the money which, under existing laws, lowed to volunteers as a commutation for clothing, the Pi-dent be and he is hereby authorized to cause the volunteer be furnished with clothing in kind, at the same rates, acc to grades, as is provided for the troops of the regular arm "Approved, January 26, 1848."

I. Under the provisions of the act of Congress clothing be furnished to volunteer troops in the service of the Us States in the same manner that it is now supplied to the reg army, and the payment of the six months advance con fion heretofore made to companies on being mustered into vice, and to individual volunteer recruits, (see August 7, 1847,) will be discontinued. In lieu of the mutation allowance every officer in charge of clothing keep an exact account, according to the forms prescribe the Quartermaster's Department, of every article which may issue to a volunteer, and will see that the proper chr may issue to a volunteer, and will see that the proper chi are made on the next muster-roll, with the exception he after mentioned, (paragraph IV.) Any neglect of the r site precautions in this respect will subject the officer to v ever loss may be thereby incurred by the United States, v will be deducted out of his pay and emoluments.

II. In settling with volunteers for clothing charged of muster-rolls as above, the settlement, for simplification, we

muster-rolls as above, the settlement, for amplification, we made by the paymester on the basis of an allowance to be two dollars and fifty cents per month, which is about monthly average to a soldier in the regular army durin term of his enlistment. The price of each article of clomust be charged at the rates fixed in general orders; any volunteer has drawn less than his allowance, he we paid the difference; if he has overdrawn the excess muster of the second or the second

III. In cases where volunteers have already received t months advance commutation, they are not, of course, er to clothing in kind in addition; and any articles that m issued in kind during the time for which they have beer the commutation allowance, must be stopped against the

the muster-rolfs.

IV. The first issue of clothing to volunteer compar being mustered into service, and to individual volunteers enrolled to fill vacancies, shall be restricted to one forag one pair of boots, two pairs of stockings, one leather and one blanket to each; and as the cost of these artic ceeds the two months' commutation money, the settlem account of clothing in such cases will be made, not on the but on the second subsequent periodical muster-roll—to un the second subsequent periodical muster-roll—to lunteer meanwhile receiving no portion of his clothing in V. Knapsacks, haversacks, and canteens will be is volunteers as they are now issued to the regular army, a counted for in the same manner. These articles will o counted for in the same manner. These articles will charged to the volunteer when lost or rendered unser-

by his own neglect.
VI. Colonels of volunteer regiments will give full at cise instructions to company commanders for carrying foregoing directions; and like instructions will be fur unteer officers on the recruiting service by their

tive superintendents.

VII. Commanders of volunteer regiments in the fig. lose no time in forwarding to the Quartermaster G Washington, special estimates for a six months' supply o ing for their regiments; and similar requisitions will be through the Adjutant General's Office, by the several s through the Adjutant General's Office, by the several stendents of the volunteer recruiting service for the amedohing necessary for the efficient prosecution of the ing operations with which they are charged. Every commanding a volunteer company, or employed in the ing service, will immediately make application to the master General for a copy of the regulations relative to ing accountability, and also for a supply of the printer forms connected therewith.

VIII. The Quartermaster's Department will take measures for establishing clothing depots in Mexico, a to the general depot at Vera Cruz, at such place, or a may be designated by the Major General Commandent. By order:

R. JONES, Adjutant Ge

R. JONES, Adjutant Ge